REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The application has been amended and is believed to be in condition for allowance.

Claims 1-9 are pending with claims 1 and 4 being independent.

There are no other formal matters outstanding.

This amendment amends claims 1 and 4 to clarify the recitation of In this regard, we note that independent claims 1 and 4 now both recite physically **opening** the communication link, and the claims make clear that the link being opened is within the protection device connected to the communications line and intermediate the two communications apparatuses.

Claims 1 and 4 were rejected under §102(e) as being anticipated by GREEN et al. 6,003,084.

Claims 2 and 5 were rejected under §103(a) as being unpatentable over GREEN et al. in view of AZUMA et al. 6,430,150; claims 3 and 8 over GREEN et al. in view of ENGEL 5,124,984; claim 6 over GREEN et al. in view of BOEBERT et al. 5,864,683 and ENGEL; claim 6 over GREEN et al. in view of BOEBERT et al; claim 9 over GREEN et al. in view of BARR 4,763,357.

The independent claims, prior to the present amendment, are believed to be patentable over the applied references. However, in an effort to advance the case, the claims have been amended. Accordingly, reconsideration and allowance of the

independent claims and the claims depending therefrom are respectfully requested.

To anticipate, the reference must show that a physical interruption is either taught or suggested by the prior art. For this recitation, the Official Action offered GREEN et al. column 10, lines 43-47, 51, and 56-57.

The passage from line 43 to 57 is reproduced below, the passages referred to by the Official Ation being shown in bold:

The filter component then processes the BIND and returns status to the communications component. Based on the status, the proxy may pass the BIND on to the X.500 server, or it may cancel both sessions and close the connections. The status to be returned on error will be configurable.

Because the proxy does not implement OSI transport, session, presentation, ACSE or ROSE layers, it will have to manually build appropriate responses to reject or even **possibly abort a connection which may be in place.** For example, if the proxy has an established TCP connection and a TP0 connection then receives a presentation P-CONNECT request with an ACSE A-ASSOCIATE request for X.400 presentation context, the proxy must **generate a rejection to this request, and close the connections.**

In the sentence spanning pages 3-4 of the Official Action, the text states that "[i]t is inherent that when connections are closed, the communication links are terminated

either physically or electronically and therefore does not patentably distinguish the invention."

However, to anticipate, GREEN et al. must disclose a physically interruption, i.e., physically opening the communications link. GREEN et al. does not disclose a physically interruption by opening the communications link, and applicant does not recite merely closing a logical connection.

The GREEN et al. patent teaches software provisions in the OSI model layers 4-7 that do not actually physically disconnect the communicating entities, i.e., by physically opening the communications link. Thus, there is no anticipation.

In review, the present invention specifically tests the communication data signal being transmitted against the actual data protocol recognized and authorized to be used on the communication link, i.e., the invention checks the communication data against the data protocol used by the receiving communications station.

When a non-standard (that is, an illegal/unauthorized) protocol is detected, the communication link is completely and physically opened. As recited in the amended claims, the link is physically opened within the protection device. This provides excellent protection against attempts from the outside to manipulate communication devices, e.g., by activating some hidden

remote diagnostic system functionality, as described in the description of the present application.

Accordingly, applicant respectfully requests that these claims be allowed. As the dependent claims include all of the recitations of the independent claims from which they depend, the dependent claims are also believed to be allowable.

In view of the above, applicant believes that the present application is in condition for allowance and an early indication of the same is respectfully requested.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 25-0120 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17.

Respectfully submitted,

YOUNG & THOMPSON

Roland E. Long, Jr., Reg. No. 41,949

745 South 23rd Street
Arlington, VA 22202
Telephone (703) 521-2297

REL/fb